

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-68 were pending. Claims 16-21 were allowed. Claims 6-11 were objected to. Claims 1-5, 12-15, and 22-68 were rejected.

Claims 6, 8, 11, 16-17, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 10, 12-15, and 22-68 have been cancelled. New claims 69-102 have been added. Claims 6-9, 11, 16-21, and 69-102 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

### **Claims 16-21**

Claims 16-21 were allowed. Claim 16, which previously recited “A computer-implemented method of implementing security for SOAP messages”, has been amended to recite “A computer-implemented method of implementing security for Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) messages.” Claim 16 (as amended) should be allowed.

Claim 17, which previously recited “A computer readable medium having computer program instructions stored therein for performing the method of claim 16”, has been amended into independent form to recite “A computer readable medium having computer program instructions stored therein for performing a method of implementing security for Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) messages exchanged between client and server programs, the method comprising: [the elements of claim 16].” Claim 17 (as amended) should be allowed.

Claim 20 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claim 20 (as amended) should be allowed.

### Claims 6-11

Claims 6-11 were objected to as depending from a rejected claim but would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (Office Action dated November 16, 2007, Detailed Action, page 2). Claim 6 has been amended to put it in independent form. Claim 8 has been amended to put it in independent form. Claim 10 has been cancelled. Claim 11 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 7 and 11 depend from claim 6. Claim 9 depends from claim 8. Thus, claims 6-9 and 11 (as amended) should be allowed.

### Claims 1-5, 12-15, and 22-68

Claims 1-5, 12-15, and 22-68 were rejected and have been cancelled.

### New Claims 69-102

New claims 69-72 depend from claim 17. Since claim 17 was allowed, claims 69-72 should also be allowed.

New claim 73 is similar to claim 16, except that it recites a “traffic manager” rather than a method. Since claim 16 was allowed, claim 73 should also be allowed. New claims 74-77 depend from claim 73. Since claim 73 should be allowed, claims 74-77 should also be allowed.

New claims 78 and 81 are similar to claim 6, except that they recite a “computer readable medium” and a “traffic manager”, respectively, rather than a method. Since claim 6 should be allowed (see above), claims 78 and 81 should also be allowed. New claims 79-80 and 82-83 depend from claims 78 and 81, respectively. Since claims 78 and 81 should be allowed, claims 79-80 and 82-83 should also be allowed.

New claims 84 and 86 are similar to claim 8, except that they recite a “computer readable medium” and a “traffic manager”, respectively, rather than a method. Since claim 8 should be allowed (see above), claims 84 and 86 should also be allowed. New claims 85 and 87 depend from claims 84 and 86, respectively. Since claims 84 and 86 should be allowed, claims 85 and 87 should also be allowed.

New claim 88 recites:

A computer-implemented method of implementing security for SOAP messages exchanged between client and server programs, the method comprising:

receiving a SOAP message;  
determining whether at least one decryption rule is associated with the SOAP message;  
attempting to decrypt the SOAP message using one or more keys associated with the at least one decryption rule when the determining determines that at least one decryption rule is associated with the SOAP message;  
determining whether at least one encryption rule is associated with the SOAP message;  
and  
encrypting the SOAP message using one or more keys associated with the at least one decryption rule when the determining determines that at least one encryption rule is associated with the SOAP message.

Both claim 88 and claim 16 recite “determining whether at least one encryption rule is associated with the SOAP message” and “encrypting the SOAP message using one or more keys associated with the at least one decryption rule when the determining determines that at least one encryption rule is associated with the SOAP message.” The Examiner stated that the prior art does not teach or suggest these claimed elements (Office Action dated November 16, 2007, Detailed Action,

page 2). Thus, claim 88 should be allowed. New claims 89-92 depend from claim 88. Since claim 88 should be allowed, claims 89-92 should also be allowed.

New claims 93 and 98 are similar to claim 88, except that they recite a “computer readable medium” and a “traffic manager”, respectively, rather than a method. Since claim 88 should be allowed, claims 93 and 98 should also be allowed. New claims 94-97 and 99-102 depend from claims 93 and 98, respectively. Since claims 93 and 98 should be allowed, claims 94-97 and 99-102 should also be allowed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and requests that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
KERRY CHAMPION

Date: August 14, 2008

By: /Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale/  
Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale, Reg. No. 55,687  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel. (650) 335-7187  
Fax (650) 938-5200